Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FEB 1 3 2006

WENDERUTH, LIND & PONACK

Best Available Copy

OIPE		
复	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Sumanary	09/422,804	SOUTHERN, EDWIN
	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAN ING DATE of this company	John S. Brusca	1631
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuth Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 136(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e. cause the application to become AB	CATION.  Eply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35.11.5.0. & 133)
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 N	Joyambar 2005	
l	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		are prosperation as to the mosts is
closed in accordance with the practice under E		
Disposition of Claims	=x parte Quayre, 1000 O.D.	17, 400 O.G. 210.
4) Claim(s) 17-99 is/are pending in the application		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>40-95</u> is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	vn from consideration.	
6) Claim(s) <u>17-26,38,39 and 96-99</u> is/are rejected		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>27-37</u> is/are objected to.	J.	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r alastias resultante et	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	r election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the c	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ¡ a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received	
		Early N. DOT/ODGG/00 too
The state priority decornerity	nave been received in App	iication No. <u>PC1/GB89/00460</u> .
the profit	ty documents have been red	ceived in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
and an arranged detailed Office action for a list of	i the certified copies not rec	eivea.
Attachment(s)		
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	🗂	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Sumr Paper No(s)/Ma	nary (PTO-413) ail Date
) [X] Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SR/08)	5) Notice of Inform	nal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/8/05, 12/20/05.	6) Other:	
Palent and Trademark Office DL-326 (Rev. 7-05)		

Art Unit: 1631

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This application has been reassigned to a new examiner.

2. Due to new grounds of rejection not necessitated by the applicant's amendments this is a non-final rejection.

#### Election/Restrictions

- 3. Claims 40-99, filed in the amendment filed 06 December 2000 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:
- 4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - 1. Claims 1-39 and 96-99 drawn to oligonucleotide arrays, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3.
  - Claims 40, 42, 43, multiple dependent claims 44-56, and 57, drawn to a method of making an oligonucleotide array by attachment of presynthesized oligonucleotides, classified in class 435, subclass 6
  - 3. Claims 41, multiple dependent claims 44-56, and 58-62, drawn to a method of making an oligonucleotide array by in situ synthesis of oligonucleotides, classified in class 536, subclass 25.3
  - 4. Claims 63-67, multiple dependent claim 70-86, 89, 90, and 95, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array to assay for hybridization of an applied sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

Art Unit: 1631

5. Claims 68, 69, multiple dependent claims 70-86, and 87, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array comprising all possible sequences, classified in class 435 subclass 6.

- 6 Claim 88, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array comprising iterative hybridization with larger oligonucleotide applied samples, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- 7. Claims 91-94, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array to assay a nucleotide sequence of an applied sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 5. Inventions 1 and Inventions 2-3 are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the array of invention 1 could be made by either the method of invention 2 or 3.
- 6. Inventions 1 and Inventions 4-7 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the array of invention 1 can be used in any of the methods of inventions 4-7.
- 7. Inventions 2-3 and Inventions 4-7 are directed to related methods. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the

Art Unit: 1631

inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, inventions 2-3 are drawn to methods of making oligonucleotide arrays which comprise different steps, and inventions 4-7 are drawn to methods of using oligonucleotide arrays which comprise different steps and produce different results.

- 8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Groups 1-7 are not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 10. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention of Invention 1, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 40-95 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

11. Many references in the Information Disclosure Statements filed 08 December 2005 and 20 December 2005 have not been considered because the references are not publications.

#### **Double Patenting**

12. The rejection for obviousness-type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,054,270 in the Office action mailed 13 July 2005 has been withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer filed 28 August 2001.

Art Unit: 1631

13. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

14. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would be obvious

Art Unit: 1631

over, the reference claim(s). see, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

15. Claims 17, 20, 25, 26, and 39 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17-42 of copending Application No. 10/115077. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending claims are either species of the instant claims or have only minor differences.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 17. Claims 17, 19, 21-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stavrianopoulos et al. (reference KB in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 08 December 2005)

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the array has a glass substrate. In some embodiments the oligonucleotides are attached to the support by a covalent linkage.

Art Unit: 1631

Regarding the limitations of claims 23 and 24, it is brought to the Applicant's attention that a product by process claim is examined for novelty and obviousness of the claimed product only, and that no consideration is given to the novelty or obviousness of the method of making the claimed product. See M.P.E.P. 2113.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 19. Claims 17, 18, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al.

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments there are at least 72 samples in the array.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of conventional microtiter plates to contain the

Art Unit: 1631

samples in columns 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show the number of wells that exist in conventional microtiter plates.

Cooke et al. shows microtiter plates that differ from the conventional plates by virtue of being made from disposable plastic. Cooke et al. shows in figure 1 a microtiter plate with an 8x12 matrix of wells for a total of 96 wells.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the 96 well microtiter plate of Cooke et al. for the purpose of analyzing up to 96 samples in one array.

20. Claims 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Suggs et al.

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the oligonucleotides in the array are between 8 and 20 nucleotides in length.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of conventional microtiter plates to contain the samples in columns 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows that the applied samples may be of small or high molecular weight in column 1, lines 29-30. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 5, lines 63-67 that oligonucleotides used to hybridize to the samples on the array should be at least 25 nucleotides in length to allow for stable hybridization with the complementary

Art Unit: 1631

nucleotides of the sample on the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show use of samples on an array of between 8 and 20 nucleotides in length.

Suggs et al. shows in the abstract, methods section on page 6613 and Table 1 the synthesis and use of oligonucleotide probes that are 15 nucleotides in length. Suggs et al. shows in figures 1 and 2 that such probes may be used to hybridize specifically to a complementary sequence.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the 15mer probes of Suggs et al. because Suggs et al. shows that oligonucleotides of that length are long enough to allow for specific hybridization and a functional equivalent to longer oligonucleotides, and further obvious because shorter oligonucleotides allow for reduced labor and cost for synthesis.

21. Claims 96, 98, and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Caulfield et al.

The claims are drawn to kits comprising arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions and scanners for detecting hybridization to the array.

Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, and shows a microtiter substrate in column 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows colorimetric assays of hybridization in column 6-7 and table 1. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show computer controlled scanners of colorimetric assays.

Art Unit: 1631

Caulfield et al. shows in the abstract and throughout a computer controlled analysis of a microtiter assay result. Caulfield et al. shows in the methods section on page 207 that an automatic scanner/reader was used to determine the level of colored product in each well of a microtiter assay, and further shows throughout the paper a computer mediated analysis of the results of the assay.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of Caulfield et al. to save manual labor of analyzing the results of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

22. Claim 97 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above, and further in view of Caulfield et al.

The claims are drawn to a kit comprising arrays of oligonucleotides comprising at least 72 different known oligonucleotides at different positions and scanners for detecting hybridization to the array.

Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above does not show computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

Caulfield et al. shows in the abstract and throughout a computer controlled analysis of a microtiter assay result. Caulfield et al. shows in the methods section on page 207 that an automatic scanner/reader was used to determine the level of colored product in each well of a

Art Unit: 1631

microtiter assay, and further shows throughout the paper a computer mediated analysis of the results of the assay.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above by use of the computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of Caulfield et al. to save manual labor of analyzing the results of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

23. Claims 17 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Molecular Biosystems Inc. (WO 85/01050, reference AF in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 08 December 2005).

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the oligonucleotide is covalently linked to the support.

Sravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show covalent linkage of oligonucleotides to supports.

Molecular Biosystems Inc. shows covalent linkages of oligonucleotides to a solid support and use of such linked oligonucleotides for hybridization assays in pages 8-9, and 34-37.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the hybridization assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the covalent linkage of Molecular Biosystems Inc. because Molecular Biosystems Inc. shows that

Art Unit: 1631

such covalent linkages are useful to tether hybridized polynucleotide duplexes for purification of the hybridized duplex in hybridization assays.

## Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 14 November 2005 regarding the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Those rejections of claims not reiterated in this Office action have been withdrawn. New grounds of rejection have been made over some claims. The applicants argue that Stavrianopoulos et al. uses the arrays for hybridization to probes, rather than using arrays of probes for hybridization to unknown samples. The intended use of the composition of Stavrianopoulos et al. is not relevant because Stavrianopoulos et al shows the claimed composition or makes obvious the claimed compositions in combination with other references as detailed above. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of known (and therefore predetermined) sequences on arrays. The applicants further argue that the samples of Stavrianopoulos et al are on different wells and are therefore on different surfaces, however a microtiter dish is a single surface comprising multiple depressions.

## Allowable Subject Matter

25. Claims 27-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

26. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are

Art Unit: 1631

available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center at (800) 786-9199. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Brusca whose telephone number is 571 272-0714. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, PhD. can be reached on 571 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1631

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Brusca
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1631

jsb

					<del></del>		7817
-'Sheet 1 of,47			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	NT .		OIPE
FORM PTO 1449	,	) RTMENT OF COMMERC	:F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		AL NO. 22,804	DEC 210 marsh
PA	TENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		ININI	PAREMON ST
Date S	•	veral sheets if necessary)  d to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
RB	62	4,689,405	8/1987	Frank et al.			
345	86	5,348,855	9/1994	Dattagupta et al.			
	<u> </u>						
· .	<del>,</del>	•	FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		··	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
165	61	1 526 708	9/1978	GB			
BB	98	0 119 573 A1	9/1994	EP			
	1	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)		
_	1		e Technology	de, Affymetrix' Opening St (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case i ngdom.			
a de la companya de l	3	Bird & Bird, Notice to Affymetrix, case no.	Admit Facts, i HC 1999 0464	in the United Kingdom litig 5, pages 1-5, January 28,	ation between 2000, London	Oxford Gene Te United Kingdon	echnology (OGT) v. n.
10 per	4	Richard Meade, Bris Kingdom litigation be June 22, 2000, Lond	tween Oxford	Defendant's Response to ti Gene Technology (OGT) v gdom.	he Claimant's Affymetrix, ca	Notice to Admit ase no. HC 1999	Facts, in the United 0 04645, pages 1-3,
	5	Bristows, Particulars Technology (OGT) v.	of Independen Affymetrix, ca	tly Valid Claims, in the Uni se no. HC 1999 04645, pa	ited Kingdom I ges 1-2, June	itigation betweer 22, 2000, Londo	n Oxford Gene on, United Kingdom.
EXAMINER		& Bruser		DATE CONSIDERI	ED 5 F.1	Mugan 20	0/

· Sheet 2 of 17			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	A	OIPE
FORM PTO 144		d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/42:	. NO. 2,804	PATE 100
	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern			A Michael
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
				J.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
			FOR	REIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	<u> </u>		
<del></del>	7	DOCUMENT	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION
	+-	NUMBER	OATE	COONTRY	COSS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	(Including Author, Title, Date, Perti	inent Pages, Etc.)		
	6	Richard Meade, Bris Oxford Gene Techno United Kingdom.	tows, Statem blogy (OGT) v	ent of Reasons, in the Unit . Affymetrix, case no. HC 1	ed Kingdom litig 999 04645, pag	ation between es 1-4, June 30	, 2000, London,
	7	Bird & Bird, Stateme v. Affymetrix, case no	nt of Oppositi	on, in the United Kingdom 4645, pages 1-5, June 30,	litigation betwee 2000, London, L	n Oxford Gene Inited Kingdom.	Technology (OGT)
	8	Bird & Bird, Re-Re-R Oxford Gene Techno United Kingdom.	e-Amended F logy (OGT) v	Particulars of Objections, in Affymetrix, case no. HC 1	the United King 999 04645, page	dom litigation be es 1-5, March 13	etween 3, 2001, London,
leske	9	Alastair Wilson QC, A Technology (OGT) v. Kingdom.	Amended Part Affymetrix, ca	ticulars of Claim, in the Uni ase no. HC 1999 82517, pa	ited Kingdom litig ages 1-11, Nove	gation between ( mber 26, 1999,	Oxford Gene Oxford, United
Just	10	Bird & Bird, Amended Technology (OGT) v. Kingdom.	l Particulars o Affymetrix, ca	of Infringement, in the Unite ase no. HC 1999 02517, pa	ed Kingdom litiga iges 12-14, Sept	tion between Or ember 1, 2000,	xford Gene London, United
2	11	Richard Meade, Defe between Oxford Gene London, United Kingd	electrology	nterclaim of the First and Si (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case r	econd Defendan no. HC 1999 025	ts, in the United	Kingdom litigation August 6, 1999,
	12	Richard Meade, Amer litigation between Oxfo 15, 2001, London, Uni	ord Gene Tec	ars of Objections of the Firs hnology (OGT) v. Affymetri	at and Second De ix, case no. HC 1	efendants, in the	e United Kingdom ges 21-37, January
AMINER	1	M. B.		DATE CONSIDERS	0 5 G 0 .	701	<del>`</del>

Chant Carte					<del></del> <del></del>	MA.		
• Sheet 3 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	<u> </u>	MAIL	DIPE-	
FORM PTO 144		n ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422	NO. / 4	ATE CA	.)
F	PATENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC	Ε	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		PATTER	20 2005	PE
	(Use se	everal sheets if necessary) and to PTO: December 20, 1		FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	MOEMARIO	
			11	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS	<del></del>	1		
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE APPROPRIAT	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
·····		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATIO YES M	N NO
	<del>                                     </del>							
	-							
				•				
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	acluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages Ftc.)	L		
	13	Magches, Re-Re-Re- Oxford Gene Technol Kingdom.	e-Amended Repology (OGT) v.	oly and Defence of Counte Affymetrix, case no. HC 19	rclaim, in the Ur 999 02517, pp. 3	nited Kingdom I 38-46, March 20	itigation betwee 000, Oxford, Uni	n ited
. La	14	Dr. David R. Bentley Technology (OGT) v London, United King	. Affyinętrix, ca	Expert Report, in the United se nos. HC 1999 04645 at	d Kingdom litiga nd HC 1999 025	tion between O 17, pages 1-38	xford Gene , January 30, 20	)01,
mele	15	Oxford Gene Techno	logy (OGT) v. A	of Dr. David Bentley, in th Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1 Indon, United Kingdom.	e United Kingdo 999 04645 and	om litigation bet HC 1999 02517	ween 7, pages 1A-1F,	
5	16 K	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. A	pert Report of Dr. David B Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1 Kingdom.	entley, in the Un 999 04645 and I	ited Kingdom li HC 1999 02517	tigation betweer 7. pages 1-17,	1
	17	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. A	pert Report of Dr. David Be Affymetrix, case nos. HC 19 ingdom.	entley, in the Un 999 04645 and I	ited Kingdom lil C 1999 02517	igation betweer , pages 1-2,	)
CAMINER		d Built		DATE CONSIDERE	0 T G .		./	

						Ma	POIDE	7
Sheet 4 of 17	<del></del>		INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEM	ENT	MAIL	Das	包
FORM PTO 1		d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	Œ	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		RIAL NO. /422,804	DELEO CHOIS	85
LIS	T OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern		1	PADEMARKO	FEL
Da		ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
	·		U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL	₹	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA	
	<del></del> -		FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	TION NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	l ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pe	digent Pages Fts		11	
elleshe	19	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lt	, Annex 4 to Exployer (OGT) v. sndon, United I	expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HO Kingdom. Expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HO	Bentley, in the	e United Kingdom and HC 1999 025	litigation betw 17, pages 1-4,	reen
dou	21	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	1099 (OG 1) V. /	pert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC (ingdom.	Bentley, in the 1999 04645 a	United Kingdom nd HC 1999 0251	litigation betwe 7. pages 1-8,	en:
_	22	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Los	OGY (OG 1) V. A	pert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC ingdom.	Bentley, in the 1999 04645 ar	United Kingdom nd HC 1999 0251	itigation betwe 7, pages 1-2,	en
	23	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lor	ogy (UGT) v. A	pert Report of Dr. David to ffymetrix, case nos. HC ingdom.	Bentley, in the 1999 04645 an	United Kingdom I ad HIS 1999 0251	itigation betwe 7, pages 1-6,	en
CAMINER		S. Bruge		DATE CONSIDER	RED F G	<i>l.</i>	mn /	

Sheet 5 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEME	ENT	MAZ.	OIPE	
FORM PTO 1448		σ) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAI 09/42		DA 18005	\$
P	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	Έ	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		AME	CX	NC.
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	TRABE	~~~
			Ŭ.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL	_	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DAT APPROPRI	
<del></del>							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		T	FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		T		
<del> </del>		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLAT YES	NO
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (	notation Author Title Out On	·			
	1			ncluding Author, Title, Date, Per				
	24	Oxford Gene Technology January 30, 2001, L	ology (OGT) v.	xpert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	l Bentley, in the L C 1999 04645 and	Inited Kingdom J HC 1999 0251	litigation betwe 17, pages 1-12	en ,
	25	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Expert Report of Dr. Davi Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	d Bentley, in the 1999 04645 and	United Kingdom I HC 1999 0251	litigation betw 7, pages 1-14,	een
	26	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) <sub>v</sub> .	Expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	d Bentley, in the 1 1999 04645 and	United Kingdom I HC 1999 0251	litigation betw 7, pages 1-5,	een
ulah	27	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v	Expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	Bentley, in the t	Jnited Kingdom HC 1999 0251	litigation betw 7, pages 1-6,	een
No pa	28	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. /	expert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC Kingdom.	Bentley, in the U 1999 04645 and	Jnited Kingdom HC 1999 02517	litigation betwe 7, pages 1-8,	 en
	29	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. A	xpert Report of Dr. David Affymetrix, case nos. HC (ingdom.	Bentley, in the L 1999 04645 and	Inited Kingdom HC 1999 02517	litigation betwe ', pages 1-8,	en
	30	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lor	ogy (OGT) v. A	xpert Report of Dr. David ffymetrix, case nos. HC ingdom.	Bentley, in the U	nited Kingdom I HC 1999 02517	itigation betwe , pages 1-4,	en
MINER		oll Brus	14.	DATE CONSIDER	RED S Cal		- 1/	

								<i>400</i>		
. Sheet 6 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISC	LOSURE STATEME	NT		All	IPE	
FORM PTO 144		d) ARTMENT OF COMMERCI	Ē	ATTY D 99_11	OCĶET NO. 74		ERIAL NO. 9/422,804	MAII	PATE OF S	
	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RENCES CITED BY APPLICAN		APPLIC Edwin	ANT Southern			187	DEC NOTE OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	E
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20, 2	005	FILING Octobe	DATE er 22, 1999			OUP 31	THADE	
			U.	S. PATENT	DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL	_	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CLAS	s su	IBCLASS	FILING DATE I	
			FORE	EIGN PATE	NT DOCUMENTS	<u> </u>			·	
		DOCUMENT		IGNEALE		21.40				
	_	NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CLAS	s su	BCLASS	TRANSLATION YES N	
				L						
	<del></del>	OTHER I	DOCUMENT(S) (I	ncluding Au	ithor, Title, Date, Perti	inent Pages, E	tc.)			
	31	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Affymeti	ix, case nos, HC	d Bentley, in 1999 04645	the United 5 and HC 1	d Kingdom 1999 0251	litigation between 1-38,	∍n
	32	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Do	logy (OGT) v.	Affymetr	ix, case nos. HC	l Bentley, in 1999 04645	the United	1 Kingdom 1999 0251	litigation between 7, pages 1-4,	÷n
	33	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v	Affymetr	x, case nos. HC	Bentley, in 1999 04645	the United and HC 1	I Kingdom 999 02517	litigation betwee 7, pages 1-2,	n
nubles	34	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. i	Affymetci	x, case nos. HC	Bentley, in 1999 04645	the United and HC 1	Kingdom 999 02517	litigation betwee 7, pages 1-4,	n
no	35	Prof. Wolfgang Pfleid Technology (OGT) v. 19, 2001, Konstanz, C	Affymetrix, cas	eport and se nos. H	d Annex 1, in the IC 1999 04645 a	United King nd HC 1999	gdom litigat 9 02517, pa	lion between ages 1-40	en Oxford Gene and 1-2, Januar	′
	36	Dr. David B. Wallace, between Oxford Gene 1-55, January 18, 200	: Lechnology (	OGT) v	Affymetrix, case i	, P.E., PH.E nos. HC 199	D., in the U	nited Kingo	dom litigation 99 02517, pages	
	37	Dr. David B. Wallace, litigation between Oxfo pages 1-25, January 1	ora Gene Tecr	nnology (	OGT) v. Attymetr	en Wallace, ix, case nos	, P.E., PH.I 5. HC 1999	D., in the U 04645 an	Jnited Kingdom d HC 1999 0251	7.
	38	Dr. David B. Wallace, litigation between Oxfo pages 1-24, January 1	ord Gene Lech	inology (i	DGT) v. Affvmetri	en Wallace, ix, case nos	P.E., PH.( . HC 1999	)., in the U	United Kingdom d HC 1999 0251	7,
AMINER		UB.					* 4			_
* "MINACL		3. Druses			DATE CONSIDERE	0 56	Selven	1. 20	00/5	- 11

Sheet 7 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	τ			
FORM PTO 144		ග ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		OIPE	40
	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern		M	ALL 2DA	81
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	TRADEN	ATT CONTRACTOR
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROP	
								<u> </u>
	<del></del>		FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	,			
<del>-</del>		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)			L
	40	litigation between Opages 1-2 and 1-8, for Prof. Edwin M. South	xford Gene Tec November 22, 2 nern, First Witn te Technology	of Dr. Paul Hyman Silverma chnology (OGT) v. Affymetr 2000, Irvine, California. ness Statement of Edwin M (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case r	ix, case nos. Ho	1999 04645	and HC 1999	02517,
Z.	41	Prof. Edwin M. South Kingdom litigation be pages 1-14, May 1, 2	tween Oxford (	MS-1 to First Witness State Gene Technology (OGT) v. United Kingdom.	ment of Edwin N Affymetrix, case	Mellor Souther e nos. HC 199	n, in the Unit 9 04645,	ed
pulle	43	Prof. Edwin M. South Kingdom litigation be pages 1-41, May 1, 2	tween Oxford (	AS-2 to First Witness State Gene Technology (OGT) v. Inited Kingdom.	ment of Edwin N Affymetrix, case	Mellor Southen e nos. HC 199	n, in the Unite 9 04645,	ed b
no	44	Prof. Edwin M. South Kingdom litigation bel pages 1-58, May 1, 20	tween Oxford (	AS-3 to First Witness Stater Gene Technology (OGT) v. nited Kingdom.	ment of Edwin M Affymetrix, case	lellor Southerr nos. HC 1999	1, in the Unite 9 04645,	·d
	45	Prof. Edwin M. Southe between Oxford Gene 2001, Oxford, United I	: Technology ((	ess Statement of Edwin Me OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no	flor Southern, in os. HC 1999 046	the United Kir 45, pages 1-1	ngdom litigati 3, January 2	on 2,
	46	Prof. Edwin M. Southe litigation between Oxfo 22, 2001, Oxford, Unit	ord Gene Tech	Fifth Witness Statement o nology (OGT) v. Affymetrix	f Edwin Mellor S , case nos. HC	Southern, in the 1999 04645, p	e United King ages 1-7, Jar	dom nuary
KAMINER	<u> </u>	Joks. Bru	Al Ja	DATE CONSIDERED	5 G O.	AUA/II	2001	

- Sheet 8 of 17			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT		3 40
FORM PTO 1449	,	d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	ε	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		EC 20 2005 W
Р	ATENT .	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		AMA	TRADEWIST CE
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
			t	I.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL	_	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
<del></del>		<u> </u>	509	REIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			
	T	DOCUMENT	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION
<del></del>	-	NUMBER		COONTRY	CLASS	30801A33	YES NO
<del></del>		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	Including Author, Title, Date, Pert	inent Pages Etc.)	1	
	47	Peter Jay Coassin,	Witness State ology (OGT) v	ment of Peter Jay Coassin Affymetrix, case nos. HC	, in the United K	ingdom litigatio ges 1-4, Janua	on between ry 22, 2001,
	48	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Oxford Gene Teshno United Kingdom.	Witness State plogy (OGT) v	ment of Timothy Stephen . Affymetrix, case nos. HC	Fell, in the United 1999 02517, pag	d Kingdom litig ges 1-11, Janu	ation between ary 18, 2001, Oxfor
Ę.	49	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gen Oxford, United Kingd	ie Technology	tness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	y Stephen Fell, i nos. HC 1999 0:	n the United Ki 2517, pages 1-	ngdom litigation 5, January 18, 200
nelles	50	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gen Oxford, United Kingd	e Technology	tness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	y Stephen Fell, ii nos. HC 1999 02	n the United Ki 2517, pages 1-	ngdom litigation 6, January 18, 200
no	51	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gen- Oxford, United Kingd	e Technology	ness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	y Stephen Fell, ir nos. HC 1999 02	n the United Kii 2517, pages 1-	ngdom litigation 8, January 18, 2001
·	52	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gene 2001, Oxford, United	e Technology	ness Statement of Timothy (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	Stephen Fell, in nos. HC 1999 02	the United Kir 517, pages 1-	ngdom litigation 11, January 18,
	53	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gene Oxford, United Kingdo	e Technology	ness Statement of Timothy (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case i	r Stephen Fell, in nos. HC 1999 02	the United Kir 517, pages 1-2	ngdom litigation 2, January 18, 2001
	54	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gene 2001, Oxford, United I	: Technology (	ness Statement of Timothy (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case r	Stephen Fell, in nos. HC 1999 02	the United Kin 517, pages 1-1	gdom litigation 1, January 18,
(AMINER	1	& Bruss		DATE CONCIDED		1	2 1/

			1				
• Sheet 9 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	An	
FORM PTO 1449		n) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		OFE
P.A	NTENT A	IND TRADEMARK OFFIC	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern	<del></del>		DEC DO 200
	(Use se	everal sheets if necessary) and to PTO: December 20, 2		FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	PADBMARK
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS		<u>-L</u>	
EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE II APPROPRIATE
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		<del>!</del>	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Perti	nent Pages, Etc.)	<del></del>	<del></del>
Miche	55	Stewart L. Huxley, V Oxford Gene Techno United Kingdom:	Vitness Statem blogy (OGT) v.	ent of Stewart Leonard Hi Affymetrix, case nos. HC	uxley, in the Unito 1999 02517, pag	ed Kingdom litiq ges 1-2, Januar	gation between y 8, 2001, Oxford
dou	56	Martin G. Johnson, N Oxford Gene Techno United Kingdom.	Vitness Staten ology (OGT) v.	nent of Martin George Joh Affymetrix, case nos. HC	nson, in the Uni 1999 02517, pag	ted Kingdom lit les 1-7, Januar	igation between y 19, 2001, Oxfor
Jes	57	Ekins R., "Multi-anal 155-168, 1989.	yte immunoass	ay", Journal of Pharmace	utical & Biomedia	cal Analysis, Vo	o. 7, No. 2, pp.
yes	58	Kimura et al., "An Im 4, pp. 41-52, 1988.	mobilized Enzy	rme Membrane Fabricatio	n Method using a	an Ink Jet Nozz	de", Biosensors, \
SP	59	Geysen et al., "Strate 102, pp. 259-274, 19	egies for epitop 87.	e analysis using peptide s	synthesis", Journ	al of Immunolo	gical Methods, V
78/2	60	Monaco et al., "Huma p. 90, 1989.	an Genome Lin	king With Cosmids and Y	east Artificial Ch	romosomes", a	bstract from CSH
Shrappy .	63	Dr. Edwig Southern, 9 0 619 321, pp. 1-17, 0	Statutory Decla Oct. 1999, Kidli	ration of Dr. Edwin South ington, United Kingdom.	ern, in the Oppos	sition Proceeding	ngs against EP N
Sto	64	Ekins R., "Why we sh on Molecular Probes:	ould move tow Technology ar	ards non-isotopic immuno nd Medical Applications, p	passay?", Presen p. 1-22, April 11-	tation at Intern 13, 1988, Flore	ational Symposiu ence, Italy.
JB	65	Lysov et al., "A New N Oligonucleotides", Do	lethod for Dete klady Biochem	ermining the DNA Nucleot istry, Vol. 303, pp. 436-43	ide Sequence by 18, Nov-Dec 1988	Hybridization v	with
XAMINER	Joli	5. Brust	<del></del>	DATE CONSIDERE	D 5 Falura	ain 2006	

		<del></del>	INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATE	MENT	Ma	OIPE
	J.S. DEP	ARTMENT OF COMMER		ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIA 09/42	L NO. 22,804	Ob Various
	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFI RENCES CITED BY APPLICA BY OFFI RENCES CITED BY APPLICA BY OFFI RENCES SAIN BY OFFI		APPLICANT Edwin Southern		- Vigi	
Date		ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	Моеман
			<u>U.</u>	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	1	<del></del>	FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		<del></del>	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pe	entinent Pages, Etc.)		
	66	Professor Edwin Solitigation between C 2000, Kidlington, U	ixtora Gene Tec	s Statement of Professo chnology (ОСТ) v. Affyn	or Edwin Mellor Sonetrix, case no. Ho	outhern, in the Ur C 1999 02517, pp	nited Kingdom o. 1-40, January
	67	Bird and Bird, Notice Gene Technology, I	e of Opposition, pp. 1-15, Oct. 19	, in the Opposition Proc 999, London, United Kin	eedings against E igdom.	P No. 0 619 321	filed by Oxford
4	68	Dr. Edwin Southern 0 619 321, pp. 1-17	Statutory Deck Oct 1999, Oxf	aration of Dr. Edwin Sou ford, United Kingdom.	thern, in the Opp	osition Proceedir	ngs against EP N
uletz	69	L oraces undarious nerv	veen Oxiora Ge	efendant's Motion for Leanne Technology (OGT) v	Athemetric IIS	nd Amended An District Court for	swer, in the Unite the District of
d ou	70	Dale Davis, Expert F	Report of Dale D	Pavis, in the United State the District of Delaware,	e litigation between	en Oxford Gene op. 1-37, August	Technology (OG 2000, Wilmingto
	71	Grant Morgan, Expe (OGT) v. Affymetrix, Atascadero, Californ	U.J. District Cu	nt Morgan, in the United urt for the District of Del	States litigation aware, CA No. 99	petween Oxford ( 1-348, pp. 1-15, <i>F</i>	Gene Technolog August 2000,
	72	Dr. Elias Corey, Expo Technology (OGT) v. 2000, Wilmington, De	AUTHOURS, U.S	Elias James Corey, in 5. District Court for the D	the United States listrict of Delaward	litigation betwee , CA No. 99-348	n Oxford Gene 3, pp. 1-10, Augu
	ı i		voed Report of	in town of the t	in the United Sta	***	
	73	Dr. James Wetmur, E Technology (OGT) v. 2000, Wilmington, De	MINISTRA, U.S.	District Court for the D	istrict of Delaware	es litigation between CA No. 99-348	een Oxford Gen , pp. 1-29, Augu
	73	2000, Wilmington, De Morris, Nichols, Arshi OGT's Motion for Sun	& Tunnell, Men mary Judgmen Affymetrix, U.S.	norandum of Points and of Validity, in the Unite	Authorities In Su	pport of Affymetr	, pp. 1-29, Augu

							<del></del>
Sheet 11 of 17			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	ANA STATE	MOIPE
FORM PTO 144	•	d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	:F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422	NO.	DEC SO
þ	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	Ε	APPLICANT Edwin Southern	<del></del>		A CONSTRUCTION OF THE PARTY OF
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	MADENIA
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS	<del></del>	<del>1</del>	
EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
			EOR	EICH BATCHT DOCUMENTS			
	. ]	DOCUMENT	DATE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS  COUNTRY	CLASS	Super see	
<del></del>	+	NUMBER	DATE	COUNTY	CDASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTUEN	DOCUMENTACE OF		<u> </u>		
	75	Di James Wetmur, Summary Judgment	Declaration of of Validity, in	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pert James G. Wetmur in Sup the United States litigation ne District of Delaware, CA	port of Affymetrix	Gene Technol	oay (OGT) v
	76	Dr. James Wetmur, Oxford Gene Technol 1-45, September 200	ology (OGT) v.	al Report of Dr. James G. Affymetrix, U.S. District C California.	Wetmur, in the U court for the Distri	nited States liti ct of Delaware,	gation between CA No. 99-348, p
3	77	Dr. Martin Adelman Technology (OGT) v. 2000, Washington, D	Affymetrix, U.	- Martin J. Adelman, in the S. District Court for the Di	e United States li istrict of Delaware	tigation betwee	n Oxford Gene 48, pp. 1-16, Augus
public	78	Summary Judgment	of Valiblity, in the	Elias James Corey in Sup he United States litigation e District of Delaware, CA	between Oxford	Gene Technologic	ony (OGT) y
200	79	Pretrial Order Exhibit: Affymetrix, U.S. Distri Delaware.	s 1-5 and 12-1 ct Court for the	in the United States litig District of Delaware, CA	gation between C No. 99-348, pp.	xford Gene Te 1-110, October	chnology (OGT) v. 2000, Wilmington
	80	Transcript of Markma Affymetrix, U.S. Distri Delaware.	n Hearing, in the	ne United States litigation e District of Delaware, CA	between Oxford No. 99-348, pp.	Gene Technolo I-149, October	ogy (OGT) v. 2000, Wilmington,
JB	81	Wada A., Abstracts of Sequencing, pp. 2-11,	Presentations July 7-9, 198	s at International Worksho 7, Okayama, Japan.	p on Automatic a	nd High Speed	I DNA Base
JB	82	Wallace et al., "Hybrid base pair mismatch",	lization of synt Nucleic Acids I	hetic oligodeoxyribonucle Research, Vol. 6, No. 11,	otides to phi and pp. 3543-3557, 1	174 DNA: the 6 979.	effect of single
MS	83	Uwe Maskos, "A novel Oxford, pp. 2-161, Nev	method of nuc v College, Oxfo	cleic acid sequence analy ord, 1991.	sis", Maskos The	sis submitted t	o University of
$\leq 1$	1						

Sheet 12 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISC	CLOSURE STATEMEN	т		A	9	
FORM PTO 1449 U.		n ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	АТТУ О 99_11	OCKET NO. 74		SERIAL (	NO. ,804	OPE	40
	F REFER	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLIC Edwin	ANT Southern				DEC 2 0 2	IBN JU
Date		ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING Octobe	DATE er 22, 1999			GROUP - 1631	THAPE!	
			U.	S. PATENT	DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CL	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROP	
			FORE	EIGN PATE	NT DOCUMENTS	<del></del>		<u> </u>	1	<del></del>
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CU	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO
7, 1,,		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	nctudina Au	ithor, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages	Etc.)	····	1	<u> </u>
	84	Bannworth, W. et al.						D:45 DMA		
XB		Support", DNA, Vol.	5, No. 5, pp. 4	13-419,	1986.	ai Syriii	iesis or i	Jillerent DINA	rragments o	n Solid
J83	85	Lohrmann, R. et al., Research, p. 122, 19	"New Solid Su 184.	pports fo	r DNA Synthesis",	Fourth	Annual (	Congress for	Recombinant	DNA
JED	87	Goldkorn, T. et al., "A Application for hybrid Research, Vo. 14, No.	lization-restrict	ion analy	rsis and for in vitro	or coval	ent attac	hment of DN A probes", N	A to cellulose ucleic Acids	•
183	88	Duncan, C. et al., "Af Oligonucleotides", Ar	finity Chromatonalytical Bioche	ography emistry, \	of a Sequence-spe /o. 169, pp. 104-1	ecific DN 08, 1988	IA Bindir 3.	ng Protein Us	ing Teflon-lin	ked
JO	89	Voss et al., "A simple matrix", Biochemical	and efficient n Society Transa	nethod for	or covalently attacl 65th meeting, Lon	hing olig ndon, pp	onucleol . 367-36	tides to a cell 8, 1987.	ulose support	
185	90	Nicholls, P. et al., "Nu Vol. 3, pp. 122-135, 1	icleic Acid Ana 989.	llysis by	Sandwich Hybridiz	ation", J	ournal o	f Clinical Lab	oratory Analy	sis.
165	91	Wallace, R. et al., "Th oligonucleotides of mi 879-894, 1981.	e use of synth xed sequence	etic oligo to rabbit	nucleotides as hyl beta-globin DNA"	bridizatio , Nucleio	on probe Acids F	s. II. Hybridiz Research, Vo	ration of I. 9, No. 4, pp	
7	-92	File wrapper of S.N. 0	7/593,589 now	/ abando	ned. filing o	late	0200	tuber 199	10. Oattas	opta
no copy.	ref	et.al.			A J			······································	,, -y	
BB	93	File wrapper of S.N. O. Liling dute of	7/772,625 mate 04 october	uring into	US 5,348,855 on	Septem	ber 199	4 to Dattagup	ota et al.	
XAMINER .	July	5. Bruses			DATE CONSIDERED	· [/	Feler	uary 2	004	

							* (AU -				
Sheet 13 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	VTT		10gm 4				
FORM PTO 1449	(modifie	<b>ઝ</b> )		ATTY DOCKET NO.		RIAL NO.	DEC 2 071005				
_		ARTMENT OF COMMERC		99_1174	09	0/422,804	13 70				
	F REFE	RENCES CITED BY APPLICAL Byeral sheets if necessary)		APPLICANT Edwin Southern							
Date		ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631					
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS							
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE				
				·							
	<del></del>		FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	_						
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO				
	·	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	nent Pages, Etc	·/					
JED	94	Sproat, B. et al., "A r No. 8, pp. 2979-298	new linkage for 7, 1985.	solid phase synthesis of c	oligonucleoti	des", Nucleic Acid	ls Research, Vol. 13,				
AB	95	Kremsky, J. et al., "Immobilization of DNA via oligonucleotides containing an aldehyde or carboxylic acid group at the 5' terminus", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, pp. 2891-2909, 1987.									
NS.	96	Wolf, S. et al., "Rapid Research, Vol. 15, N	d hybridization o. 7, pp. 2911-	kinetics of DNA attached t 2926, 1987.	lo submicror	n latex particles", N	lucleic Acids				
JA D	97	Atkinson, T., "A convo	enient procedu cids Research,	re for the synthesis of olig Vol. 16, No. 13, p. 6232,	odeoxyribon 1988.	ucleotide affinity o	columns for isolation				
	99	Court Transcript of Te v. Mergen Ltd et al., t Wilmington, Delaware	J.S. District Co	orial, in the United States li ourt for the District of Delav	tigation betw vare, CA No	veen Oxford Gene . 02-1695, pp. 1-7	Technology (OGT) 2, December 2003,				
ho.	100	Blank Rome LNP, OG (OGT) v. Mergen Nd 2003, Wilmington, De	et al., U.S. Dist	y Tutorial, in the United State of the District of the Distric	ates litigation f Delaware,	n between Oxford CA No. 02-1695, p	Gene Technology op. 1-28, December				
publisho	101	States illigation betwe	en Uxtord Gen	n, Ltd.'s Slide Presentation te Technology (OGT) v. Me 11, December 2003, Wilm	eraen Ltd et	al U.S. District C.	utorial, in the United ourt for the District				
y ou	102	the United States litigates	Patton Boggs LLP, Defendant Clontech Laboratories Slide Presentation for the December 18, 2003 Tutorial, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-33, December 2003, Wilmington, Delaware.								
	103	Kirkland & Ellis LLP, Letter to Perkins Coie LLP enclosing OGT's Claim Terms, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-6, April 2004, Chicago, Illinois.									
AMINER	Ja.	B. Bruser DATE CONSIDERED 5 Falman 2016									
	<del>~ " - "</del>				<u> </u>	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	1)				

<del></del>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				A,	·			
Sheet 14 of 17	<del></del>		INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE	STATEMENT		AND PE				
FORM PTO 144		d) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO 99_1174	<b>)</b> .	SERIAL 09/422	,	NO SAN	4286		
•	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern	1	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	B	DEC 2 O TO	78		
Date		ed to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 199	99		GROUP 1631	IRABBHA			
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUME	NTS	·					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	C	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROP			
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUM	MENTS		I				
	_	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	ď	LASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO		
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, I	Date, Pertinent Page	s. Etc.)			L		
	104	1 1	lergen Ltd.'s Cl ne Technology	aim Terms and P	roposed Constr	uction in	the United Sta ourt for the Dis	ates litigation trict of Delaw	are, CA		
	105	Dr. Paul Purdue, Exp Gene Technology (C	Dr. Paul Pyrdue, Expert Report of Paul Edward Purdue Ph.D., in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-10, May 2004, New York, NY.								
	106	Dr. Paul Purdue, Exp Gene Technology O pp. 1-13, June 2004	v. Mergen	Lid et al., U.S. Di	ue Ph.D., in the istrict Court for t	United Si he Distric	lates litigation t of Delaware,	between Oxf CA No. 02-1	ord 695,		
15 Ker	107	Potter Anderson & Control Technology Ltd's First Technology (OGT) v. June 2004, Wilmington	Mergen Ltd et	set of interrogator	ries in the Unite	actet2 he	litigation boby	ann Orderd C			
900	108	Blank Rome LLP, Ox between Oxford Gene No. 02-1695, pp. 1-18	e recunology (	UGI) v. Mergen I	tdetal USD	Brief, in istrict Co	the United Sta art for the Distr	tes litigation rict of Delawa	ıre, CA		
20	109	Potter Anderson & Co litigation between Oxf Delaware, CA No. 02-	ora Gene Tech	เกดเดสง (เมเรา พ.ศ	Mergen I Id et al	II C D	Brief, in the t strict Court for	United States The District of	ıf		
	110	Potter Anderson & Co Invalidity of Claim 1 oi litigation between Oxf Delaware, CA No. 02-	ord Gene Tech	nology (OGD v A	1,270 Pursuant ( Mergen 1 td et al	o 35 U.S.	C 112 in the	Hailad Ct-t-	_		
	111	Potter Anderson & Co. Support of its Motion for Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. et al., U.S. District Co. Delaware.	or Summary Ju 112, in the Uni	ogment of Invalid	ity of Claim 1 of	United S	tates Patent N	10. 6,054,270	. 6		
AMINER		& Bruser		DATE OF	NSIDERED T	61	<u> </u>	/			

Sheet 15 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	17		6	W.		
FORM PTO 1449 U.	•	ஏ) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	Ε	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		DEC BO JULY	COFFIC		
	of REFEI	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA		APPLICANT Edwin Southern			SWENT A TRADE	C		
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 20, 3	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631				
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			<del></del>	_		
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE APPROPRIAT			
			FOR	TICAL PATENT POCUMENTO	<u> </u>					
·····		DOCUMENT	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	0,100,100		_		
	-	NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATIOI YES N			
		OTHER	DOCUMENT/S) //	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	Dest Const. State			_		
0	113	Order and Memorand between Oxford Gen No. 02-1695, pp. 1-2	Blank Rome LLP, Oxford Gene Technology's Claim Construction Brief In Response to Mergen's Claim Construction Briefing, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergal., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-118, August 2004, Wilming Delaware.  Order and Memorandum Opinion of the U.S. District Court on Claim Construction, in the United State between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware.  Order and Memorandum Opinion of the U.S. District Court on Expert Reports, in the United States litit between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware.							
6/15/	115	Order and Memorand between Oxford Gene	lum Opinion of	the U.S. District Court on OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., 004, Wilmington, Delaware	Summary Judgn	nent, in the Un urt for the Distr	ited States litigati rict of Delaware,	OI C/		
no on	116	States litigation between	en Oxford Ger	ergen Limited's Motion for f ed's Motion for Partial Sum ne Technology (OGT) v. Mo 16. December 2004, Wilm	mary Judgment ergen I td et al	of Infringemen U.S. District Co	at in the United			
	117	Reconsideration, in the	e United State:	inology Limited's Oppositions litigation between Oxford Delaware, CA No. 02-1695	Gene Technolo	ny (OGD y M	argon I to at at	_		
	118	Courts Crock, in the O	inten States III	gen Limited's Reply in Sur igation between Oxford Ge are, CA No. 02-1695, pp.	na lachaology	(OCT) Mass				
	119	Blank Rome LLP, Lette	er to Judge Jor Tergen Ltd et a	dan re claim terms, in the	United States St		0.6.10			
INER	1	K Busic		DATE CONSIDERED	560	wary 200	./			

Shoot 16 of 17								<del></del>			
Sheet 16 of 17 FORM PTO 144				ATTY DOCKE	T NO.	SERIAL 09/42		PE 44	*		
F	PATENT OF REFE	PARTMENT OF COMMERC AND TRADEMARK OFFICE PRENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin Sout	hern	_1		DEC 200 TON			
Date		several sheets if necessary) ted to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING DATE October 22	, 1999		GROUP 1631	THE REAL TRADE			
	<del></del>		U.	S. PATENT DOC	UMENTS						
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NA	ME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE APPROPRIA			
						·			<del></del>		
		<b>—</b>	FORE	IGN PATENT DO	CUMENTS						
	-	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COU	ITRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATIO YES I	40 )N		
(						<del></del>					
C Copies	120	1 \	strict Court on follogy (OGT) v.	al IIS District C	tion in th	e United States e District of De	s litigation betwe laware, CA No.	en			
HS	121	Khrapko, K. et al., "A pp. 118-122, Octobe	n oligonucleoti r 1989.	de hybridizati	on approach to DN	A sequen	cing", FEBS, V	ol. 256, Nos. 1-2	2.		
20 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	122	Potter Anderson & Ca First Set of Interrogal International et al., U Wilmington, Delaward	S. District Cou	med Sixies m	ination behieve ( )	viard Can	a Taabaataa A	^^-	em		
Jeo	123	Polsky-Cynkin, R. et a Hybridization", Clinica	al., "Use of DNA al Chemistry, V	A Immobilized ol. 31, No. 9, p	on Plastic and Ag	arose Sup 35.	oports to Detec	t DNA by Sandw	<i>r</i> ich		
ζ	124	Michael Best & Friedr litigation between Oxfo District of Illinois, CA I						the United State Northeastern	es		
10 publish	125	Brinks Hofer Gilson & Gene Technology (OG 02-9344, pp. 1-39, Jar				the United Northeast	d States litigation	on between Oxfo linois, CA No.	ord		
40 or	126	Brinks Hofer Gilson & between Oxford Gene Illinois, CA No. 02-934	I COMINION IN	OIIV. WILHOR	117 INC 11 \ 1 NCTA	hibits A-Z	, the United Start the Northeas	ales litigation stern District of			
	127		oks Hofer Gilson & Lione, Motorola's Response Markman Brief, Exhibits A(1)-G(1), the United States litigation ween Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Dis, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-51, January 2004, Chicago, Illinois.								
	128	Brinks Hofer Gilson & L between Oxford Gene Illinois, CA No. 02-934				nibits 1-3, at Court fo	the United Star the Northeast	tes litigation tern District of			
AMINER	Jos. Guns			DATE	CONSIDERED 5	Felow	ada 2026		$\dashv$		

Sheet 17 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	AM	PE 40
FORM PTO 144	9 (modifie	<b>a</b> )		ATTY DOCKET NO.		AL NO.	- 3000 W
Р	ATENT	ARTMENT OF COMMERC AND TRADEMARK OFFIC	E	99_1174  APPLICANT Edwin Southern	09/42	22,804	DEC SOLING E
	(Use s	RENCES CITED BY APPLICA everal sheets if necessary) and to PTO: December 20, 1		FILING DATE October 22, 1999	<del></del>	GROUP 1631	Otto march
<del></del>		······································		S. PATENT DOCUMENTS		1 1001	
'EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			<u> </u>
<del></del>		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
_							
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Perti	nent Pages, Etc.)		
	129	Michael Best & Fried	drich LLP, OGT OGT) v. Motoro	's Reply to Markman Briella, Inc., U.S. District Court	f. in the United	States litigation astern District o	between Oxford f Illinois, CA No.
	130	Michael Best & Fried Technology (OGT) v pp. 1-10, March 200	. Motorola, Inc.	's Exhibit A Claim Chart, i , U.S. District Court for the nois.	n the United Sta e Northeastern	ates litigation be District of Illinoi	etween Oxford Gen s, CA No. 02-9344
	131	Michael Best & Fried Technology (OGT) v. pp. 1-139, March\200	. Motorola, Inc.	's Exhibit 1-9, in the United , U.S. District Court for the inois.	d States litigation Northeastern	on between Oxfo District of Illinois	ord Gene s, CA No. 02-9344,
13/8/	132	Michael Best & Fried Technology (OGT) v. pp. 1-222, March 200	Wotorola, Inc.,	's Exhibit H-R, in the Unite , U.S. District Court for the nois.	ed States litigation Northeastern I	on between Oxt District of Illinois	ford Gene 5, CA No. 02-9344,
11900	133	Civil Docket for CA N Delaware, pp. 1-36, A	o. 99-0348, Ox April 2005, Wilr	oford Gene Technology (Onington, Delaware.	GT) v. Affymetr	ix, Inc., U.S. Di	strict Court for
110	134	Civil Docket for CA No Delaware, pp. 1-31, A	o. 02-1695, Ox April 2005, Wiln	ford Gene Technology (Onlington, Delaware.	GT) v. Mergen,	Ltd., U.S. Distri	ict Court for
	135	Civil Docket for CA No Court for Delaware, p	p. 1-7, April 20	ford Gene Technology (Od 05, Wilmington, Delaware	GT) v. Telechen	n International,	Inc., U.S. District
	136	Civil Docket for CA No Delaware, pp. 1-5, Ap	o. 02-1687, Oxi ril 2005, Wilmii	ford Gene Technology (OC ngton, Delaware.	GT) v. Nanogen	, Inc., U.S. Dist	rict Court for
	137	Civil Docket for CA No Northeastern District o	o. 02-9344, Oxf of Illinois, pp. 1-	ord Gene Technology (OC 4, April 2005, Chicago, Illi	GT) v. Motorola, inois.	Inc., U.S. Distr	ict Court for the
IINER	1, K	(3)	<del>~~~</del>	DATE CONSIDERE	0	\ .	

Sheet 1 of 13	·		INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT	·		
FPREPTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMER	CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		NL NO. 22,804		
~ 08 3005 L	FREFER	ENCES CITED BY APPLIC	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN				
TRADENIN ate		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
			υ	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D	
M)	AA	4,216,245	8/1980	Johnson	427	2		
MA	AB	4,395,486	7/1983	Wilson et al.	435	6		
Jes .	AC	4,563,419	1/1986	Ranki et al.	435	6		
<u> </u>			FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
1.0		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	ATION NO
19(5	AD	0 235 726	9/1987	EP				
\$5	AE	0 171 150	2/1986	EP				
185	AF	85/01051	3/1985	wo				
J83	AG	0 268 237	5/1988	EP				
	АН							
	· · · · · ·	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)			
	Al			kov (with four exhibits), Se				
	LA	Declaration from Iva	n Labat , Septe	ember 1996.				
ş	AK	Statement from the 1996.	nstitute of Mole	cular Genetics and Geneti	ic Engineering	(IMGGE) in Belgr	ade, Septen	nber
nelle	AL	Statement by Profes symposium, and a po	sor Roger Ekins	s (with an abstract of a lect aper corresponding to said	ture given by hi I lecture), Dece	m on 4/11/88 at a mber 1996.	3	
200	АМ	Statutory Declaration	of Dr. Nichlola	s Vaughan Ashely (with Ex	khibit NVA1), M	ay 1995.		
,	AN	Statutory Declaration	of Dr. William I	Bains (with Exhibits WB1,	WB2 and WB3	), May 1995.		
MINER	Tell	Busa	·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DATE CONSIDERE	0 160	704/	<del></del>	

			· .					
Sheet 2 of 13			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	NT			
FORM PTO 1449	S. DEPAR	TMENT OF COMMER	lCE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		AL NO. 22,804		
P/	ATENT AND F REFEREN	D TRADEMARK OFFI ICES CITED BY APPLIC	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN				
Date		ral sheets if necessary) to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999	GROUP 1631			
<del></del>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE	
J8/2	ВА	4,704,353	11/1987	Humphries et al.	435	4		
165	BB	4,327,073	4/1982	Huang	424	1		
(h)	ВС	4,728,502	3/1988	Hamill	422	116		
Jeb .	BD	5,002,867	3/1991	Macevicz	435	6		
<u>V</u>	т		FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
1	<u> </u>	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO	
16/5	BE	88/01302	2/1988	WO				
Jes	BF	86/03782	7/1986	WO				
J.B.	BG	0 238 332	9/1987	EP				
100	ВН	2 156 074	10/1985	GB				
165	ВІ	0 237 362	9/1987	EP				
	<del>                                     </del>	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertine	ent Pages, Etc.)			
	BJ (	Declaration of Profe	ssor Lubert Stry	ver, January 1997.				
	вк ѕ	Statutory Declaration	n of Dr. William	Bains, January 1997.				
raha	BL S	tatutory Declaration	n of Dr. Nicholas	s Vaughan Ashley, January	/ 1997.			
quela	BM D	eclaration of Edwin	Mellor Southern	n (with Exhibits EMS1 and	EMS2), Janua	ry 1998.		
Ma	BN De	eclaration of Dr. Th	omas Gingaras,	, January 1999.				
	BO De	eclaration of Profes	sor Calvin Quat	e, January 1999.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	, ,	·		\			_	
MINER	1251	Swars		DATE CONSIDERED	561.	700	/	

Sneet 3 of 13 .			INFORM	FORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT						
FORM PTO 1448		) RTMENT OF COMMER	CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL NO. 09/422,804				
Ρ.	ATENT A OF REFER	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICATION	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN						
Date		veral sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE GROUP October 22, 1999 1631						
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
*EXAMINER . INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLAS	S SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE			
JB.	CA	5,202,231	4/1993	Drmanac et al.	435	6				
X	СВ	5,474,796	12/1995	Brennan	427	2.13				
163	СС	5,429,807	7/1995	Matson et al.	422	131				
	<del></del>		FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS						
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLAS	S SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO			
12/3	CD	89/11548	11/1989	wo						
JB3	CE	93/22480	11/1993	wo						
Jest .	CF	0 386 229	9/1990	EP						
1865	CG	0 281 927	9/1988	EP						
183	СН	0 130 739	1/1985	EP						
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc	:)				
S	CI	Declaration of Dr. G	lenn Mc Gall, Ja	anuary 1999.						
eles,	C1	Declaration of Edwin	Mellor Souther	rn, July 2001.						
32	СК	Bird & Bird, "Claimar Technology (OGT) v.	nt's Notice of Ex Affymetrix, cas	operiments", In the United I se no. HC 1999 02517, pp	Kingdom Li D. 1-12, July	tigation between Oxl 31, 2000, London, t	ford Gene United Kingdom.			
	CL	Declaration of Marvir	Stodolsky, Oc	tober 1996.						
XB		M. S. Urdea et al., "A novel method for the rapid detection of specific nucleotide sequences in crude biological samples without blotting or radioactivity; application to the analysis of hepatitis B virus in human serum", Gene, Vol. 61, 1987, pp. 253-264.								
Jess	CN	C. G. Miyada et al., "Oligonucleotide Hybridization Techniques", Methods in Enzymology, Vol. 154, No. 6, 1987, pp. 94-107.								
KAMINER	Jo	L. Brusia		DATE CONSIDERE	0 56	elinera Josh				

Sheet 4 of 13.			INFORM	AATION DI	SCLOSURE STATEME	<del></del>	=			*
FORM PTO 144		PO)  ARTMENT OF COMMER		ATTY	DOCKET NO. 1174		SERIAL 09/422			
۶	PATENT OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RENCES CITED BY APPLICATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	CE		ICANT n SOUTHERN					
Date		ted to PTO: December 8,	2005	1 .	G DATE ber 22, 1999			GROUP 1631		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		t	J.S. PATEI	IT DOCUMENTS	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>		
'EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	ASS	SUBCLASS	SUBCLASS FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE		
18/2	DA	4,591,570	5/1986		Chang	4	36	518		
<u> </u>	DB	-						·	-	
	DC									
			FOR	EIGN PAT	ENT DOCUMENTS					
<del></del>	<u> </u>	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CL	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLAT YES	TION NO
JAS.	DD	0 228 075	7/1987		EP					
25	DE	84/03151	8/1984		wo					
JB	DF	0 194 132	9/1986		EP					
183	DG	0 063 810	11/1982		EP					:
JEB	DH	0 130 523	1/1985		EP					
<u> </u>		OTHER I	DOCUMENT(S) (In	icluding Au	ithor, Title, Date, Pertine	ent Pages, i	Etc.)			
SP	DI	E. Calva et al., "Anal Gel Electrophoresis, Chemistry, Vol. 255,	KNA-UNA Hyt	ondizatio	n, and RNase T1 I	ibeled Tr Digestion	anscripts ", The Jo	s from Colipha ournal of Biolo	ge λ by gical	-
SP	DJ	A. R. Dunn et al., "A mRNA and Discrete I	Novel Method Multiple Region	to Map 1	ranscripts: Eviden Viral Genome", Ce	ce for Ho	mology 2, Septe	between an Ad mber 1977, pp	denovirus D. 23-36.	
96	DK	G. Wengler et al.,"A S Alphaviruses", Virolog	Study of Nucleo	otide Se . 1, 1977	quence Homology , pp. 124-134.	Between	the Nuc	leic Acids of D	ifferent	
JED.	DL	J. M. Coffin et al., "Str Sequence" Cell, Vol.	ructure of the C 13, No. 4, April	Senome 1978, p	of Moloney Murine p. 761-773.	Leukem	ia Virus:	A Terminally I	Redundant	
JB	DM	A. Palva et al., "Labor Acid Sandwich with H	atory Methods, ybridization", D	, Quantif INA, Vol.	ication of α-Amylas 7, No. 2, 1988, pp	se mRNA ). 135-14	in <i>Bacil</i> 2.	lus subtilis by	Nucleic	
JEB	DN	R. Drmanac et al., "Se presented at Cold Spri Spring Harbor, NY.	quencing of Ming Harbor Syn	egabase nposium	Plus DNA by Hyb on Gene Mapping	ridization and Seq	: Theory luencing	of the Method , April 27-May	l", abstract 1, 1988, Cold	
AMINER	M	Bruses			DATE CONSIDERED	56	oli su	un 200 h	,	

Sheet 5 of 13			INFORM	RMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT							
FORM PTO 1449 U.		ARTMENT OF COMMER	CE		DOCĶET NO. 1174		SERIAL 09/422				
PA	ATENT A OF REFER	AND TRADEMARK OFFI RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	CE	APPLI Edwii	CANT 1 SOUTHERN						
. Date		ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	1	FILING DATE GROUP October 22, 1999 1631						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			U	I.S. PATEN	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
*EXAMINER . INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	Cı	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROF		
Ţ	EA				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					-	
	EB				·						
·	<del></del>	<del></del>	FOR	EIGN PAT	ENT DOCUMENTS						
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CL	ASS	SUBÇLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO	
1813	EC	0 142 299	5/1985		EP						
Jes	ED	86/06487	11/1986		wo						
Jeb	EE	84/03564	9/1984		wo						
Jes	EF	86/00991	2/1986		wo						
Jeb	EG	92/10092	6/1992	-	wo						
	<b></b>	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	ncluding Au	rthor, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages,	Etc.)		L		
AG	EH	R. Drmanac et al., "S Harbor Symposium	Sequencing by	Hybridiz	ation . Theory of ti	ne Metho	d" nost	er presented a Cold Spring H	et Cold Spring arbor, NY.	3	
35,800	EI	1. Labat "Subfragme Report, Labat Thesis	nts as an inform , (and English	mative cl translation	haracteristic of the on), 1988.	DNA me	olecule -	computer sim	ulation", Sea	ırch	
10/4	EJ	R. Frank et al., "Simu Complete Methodolo	ultaneous Syntt gy", Methods ir	nesis and Enzym	d Biological Applic ology, Vol. 154, No	ations of o. 13, 19	DNA Fr 87, pp. 2	agments: An 8 221-251.	Efficient and		
A8,2	EK	R. Frank et al., "A ne oligonucleotides: seg	w general appr mental solid su	oach for pports",	the simultaneous Nucleic Acids Res	chemica search, \	l synthe /ol. 11, f	sis of large nu No. 13, 1983, p	mber of op. 4365-437	7.	
Λ. Ι	- 1	A. R. Brautigam et al. Deoxyribonucleic Acid pp. 226-234.	R. Brautigam et al., "Rapid Typing of Herpes Simplex Virus Isolates by Deoxyribonucleic Acid: eoxyribonucleic Acid Hybridization", Journal of Clinical Microbiology, Vol. 12, No. 2, August 1980, p. 226-234.								
JB	ЕМ	R. K. Saiki et al., "Ana Oligonucleotide Probe	llysis of Enzym	atically A	Amplified β-globin ovember 1986, pp	and HLA . 163-16	-DQα D 6.	NA with Allele	-Specific		
AMINER	Jos. Buser				DATE CONSIDERED 5 Fabruary 2006						

Sheet 6 of 13 ·	<del></del>	<del></del>	INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT						
FORM PTO 144		ர) ARTMENT OF COMMER	CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	_	ERIAL NO. 9/422,804					
Ρ	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFI RENCES CITED BY APPLIC	CE .	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN							
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631					
·····			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS							
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLAS	S SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROF				
<del>.</del>	FA										
<del></del>	FB		<u> </u>				<u> </u>				
<del></del>		1	FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>			
10/2		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO			
16)	FC	0 305 929	3/1989	EP							
365	FD	0 304 202	2/1989	EP							
	FE										
	FF										
	FG										
	1	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.	·····					
JB	FH	different eligodeoxyr	ibonucleotides	ethods for sequencing of r using a new, mechanically r 4,1985, pp. 1173-1184.	nucleic acids y stable anio	s I. Simultaneous s on-exchange pape	equencing of ". Nucleic Aci	d			
860	FI	B. Lewin, Ed., "Gen	es", Third Editio	on, 1987, pp. 360-362, Joh	nn Wiley & S	Sons, NY, NY.					
John	FJ	R. B. Wallace et al., Base Pair Mismatch	"Hybridization o , Nucleic Acids	of Synthetic Oligodeoxyribo Research, Vol. 6, No. 11,	onucleotides 1979, pp. 3	s to O <sub>x</sub> 174 DNA: T 543-3557.	he Effect of Si	ngle			
Jos Jos Jos Jos Jos	FK	G. Beltz et al., "Isolat Methods", Methods in	. Beltz et al., "Isolation of Multigene Families and Determination of Homologies by Filter Hybridization ethods", Methods in Enzymology, Vol. 100, No. 19, 1983, pp. 266-285.								
Jes 1	FL	Russian Onginal, Vol.	. 303, No. 1-6, N	of the Academy of Science November-December 1988 um Publishing Corporation	8 nn 355-4	52 and Translation	Section, I from Russiar	١,			
ps	FM	F. C. Kafatos et al., "[ a dot Hybridization Pro	Determination of occedure", Nucle	f Nucleic Acid Sequence Feic Acids Research, Vol. 7	domologies , No. 6, 1979	and Relative Cond 9, pp. 1541-1552.	entrations by				
AMINER	lace	(Bruses		DATE CONSIDERE	n 5 G	1.4.104 71	٦ /				

Sheet 7 of 13 ·	···		INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	NT		
	FORM PTO 1449 (modified)  U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					IAL NO. 122,804	
P	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN			
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
	-		U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF
	GA						
	GB						
	GC						
			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
	GD	,					
	GE						
<del></del>	GF						
	GG						
<del></del>	GH						
	<del>, '</del>	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertind	ent Pages, Etc.)		
A63	GI	R. J. Lipshutz et al., Vol. 19, No. 3, 1995,	"Using Oligonu pp. 442-447.	cleotide Probe Arrays to A	ccess Genetic	Diversity", BioTe	chniques,
JSD	GJ	T. R. Gingeras et al., 15, No. 13, 1987, pp	"Hybridization . 5373-5390.	Properties of Immobilized	Nucleic Acid"	, Nucleic Acids Re	esearch, Vol.
J65.	GK	P.T. Gilham, "The Sy Polynucleotides", J. A	nthesis of Poly Am. Chem. Soc	rnucleotide-Celluloses and c., Vol. 86, November 20, 1	Their use in tl 1964, pp. 4982	ne Fractionation o 2-4985.	ſ
JB	GL	H. M. Geysen et al., " Methods, Vol. 102, 19	Strategies for I 987, pp. 259-27	Epitope Analysis using Pep 74.	otide Synthesi	s", Journal of Imm	unological
J.D	GM	G. M. Church et al., "(	Genomic Sequ	encing", Proc. Natl. Acad.	Sci., Vol. 81(7	), April 1984, pp. 1	1991-1995.
JB	GN	V. J. Kidd et al., "α <sub>1</sub> -A Nature, Vol. 304, July	ntitrypsin Defic 1983, pp. 230-	iency Detection by Direct A 234.	Analysis of the	Mutation in the G	ene",
AMINER	Jan.	( Bruses	<del></del>	DATE CONSIDEREI	o 5 Fal	man 200	7

Sheet 8 of 13 ·			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME	ENT		
FORM PTO 1449 (modified)  U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)				ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		al no. 22,804	
				APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN			
Date		ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
	<del></del>	<del>   </del>	Ų	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF
	НА						
	НВ						
	нс						
	НО						
4	<del></del>	<b>_</b>	FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			
	ļ	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
	HE						
	HF						
	<del></del>	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pert	linent Pages, Etc.)		
HB	HG	P. Masinkowski et a Breast Cancer Cell	I.,"Cloning f cD Line", Nucleic /	NA Sequences of Hormo Acids Research, Vol. 10, I	ne-regulated Ge No. 24, 1982, pp	ene from the MCF o. 7895-7903.	-7 Human
JB S	нн	G. K. Sim et al., "Us Multigene Families",	e of a cDNA Lil Cell, Vol. 18, I	brary for Studies on Evolu No. 4, December 1979, pp	ntion and Develop. 1303-1316.	ppment Expressio	n of the Chorion
J M/S	н	Margaret L. M. Ande Approach, 1985, pp	rson et al., "Qu . 73-111, IRL P	uantitative Filter Hybridisa Press, Washington, D.C.	tion", Nucleic A	ction Hybridisation	n, A Practical
	HJ.	W. Bains et al., "A N pp. 303-307.	ovel Method fo	r Nucleic Acid Sequence	Determination*,	J. Theor. Biol., V	ol. 135, 1988,
RS.	нк	U. B. Voss et al., "Th Society Transactions	e Immobilizatio , Vol. 16, 1988	on of Oligonucleotides and , pp. 216-217.	d Their Hybridiz	ation Properties",	Biochemical
X	HL	13, 1987, pp. 5353-5	372.	of oligonucleotides to Sol	lid Supports", No	ucleic Acids Rese	arch, Vol. 15, No
J.	НМ	1	igs, Vol. 43, No	o. 7, May 4, 1984, Abstrac		novel unive	irsal
JA/S	ни			", A Laboratory Manual, (		bor Laboratory, 19	982, p. 282, Cold
NER		Burn		DATE CONSIDER	50 TG1	vary 200	<del>/</del>

			<del></del>						
Sheet 9 of 13 •			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATE	MENT				
FORM PTO 1449 (modified)  U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL 09/422				
Р	OF REFE	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					<del></del>
Date		everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999			GROUP 1631		
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			<u> </u>		
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	Ci	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D	
	IA								
<u> </u>		<b></b>	FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	<u> </u>			,	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CL	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	NOITA
	IB		_						
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	Including Author, Title, Date, F	Pertinent Pages	, Elc.)			
jes	IC	C. R. Cantor et al., " pp. 1378-1383.	Report on the	Sequencing by Hybridi	zation Work	shop", C	Genomics, Vol.	13, 1992,	
JB	ID .	T. L. Bugawan et al., Sequencing-Specific	, "Rapid HLA-I : Oligonucleoti	OLB Typing Using Enzy de Probes", Immunoge	matically Ar netics, Vol.	mplified I 32, 1990	DNA and Nonra ), pp. 231-241.	adioactive	
no political	ΙE	Global Technology C	Group, Flier for	PA Consulting Group,	1988.	<u> </u>		-	
SC	!F	Stephen P. A. Fodor Vol. 251, February 15	et al., "Light-C 5, 1991, pp. 76	Pirected, Spatially Address7-773.	essable Para	allel Che	emical Synthesi	is", Science,	
yo	IG	U. Maskos et al., "A S Synthesised on a Gla	Study of Oligor ss Support", N	nucleotide Reassociatio Nucleic Acids Research	on using Lar , Vol. 21, No	ge Array 5. 20, 19	rs of Oligonucle 192, pp. 4663-4	eotides 669.	-
yo	IH	U. Maskos et al., "Par Factors Influencing O pp. 1675-1678.	rallel Analysis ligonucleotide	of Oligodeoxyribonucle Duplex Formation", Nu	otide (Oligo cleic Acids	nucleotic Researc	de) Interactions th, Vol. 20, No.	s. I. Analysis 7, 1992,	of
JS.	11	J. C. Williams et al., " Dangling Ends on Du	Studies of Olig plex Yield", N	gonucleotide Interaction ucleic Acids Research,	s by Hybrid Vol. 22, No.	isation to . 8, 1994	o Arrays: The li	nfluence of 57.	
AC)	เม	E. M. Southern et al., of Nucleic Acids, Nucl	"Arrays of Cor eic Acids Res	nplementary Oligonucle earch, Vol. 22, No. 8, 1	eotides for A 994, pp.136	nalysing 8-1373.	the Hybridisal	tion Behavior	nı
X6	ΙK	M. S. Shchepinov et a Nucleic Acids Researc	I.,"Steric Facto	ors Influencing Hybridis 6, 1997, pp. 1155-116	ation of Nuc 31.	leic Acid	ds to Oligonucle	eotide Arrays	;",
JO.	IL	S. C Case-Green et al to Oligonucleotides", N	,"Studies on t lucleic Acids F	he Base Pairing Proper Research, Vol. 22, No. 2	ties of Deox 2, 1994, pp.	ryinosine 131-136	e by Solid Phas 3.	se Hybridisati	ion
AMINER		1. Brusis	<del></del>	DATE CONSIDE	RED 5	Cilia	wary 20	w) /	

Sheet 10 of 13			INFORM	NATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	łT		
FORM PTO 1449		on ARTMENT OF COMMERC	CF	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	1	AL NO. 22,804	
P.A	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RENCES CITED BY APPLICATE	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN			
Date		everal sheets if necessary) led to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
			U	J.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	JA						Ĺ
•	<del></del>		T FOR	REIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	т	<del></del>	r
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
	JB		<u> </u>	<u></u>			
	<del></del>	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	(Including Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)		<del></del>
B	JC	U. Maskos et al., "A Acids Research, Vo		d for the Parallel Analysis of 1993, 2269-2270.	Multiple Mutat	ions in Multiple S	Samples", Nucleic
Jes	JD	M. J. Kozal et al., "Extensive Polymorphisms Observed in HIV-1 Clade B Protease Gene Using F Oligonucleotide Arrays", Nature Medicine, Vol. 2, No. 7, July 1996, pp. 753-759.			ing High-Density		
JRS	JE	M. Chee et al., "Acce 1996, pp. 610-614.	essing Genetic	c Information with High-Den	sity DNA Array	/s", Science, Vol	. 274, October
H	JF	Kirk -Othmer, Encycl	lopedia of Che	emical Technology, Third Ed	lition, Vol. 3, p	p. 487-491, 1978	3.
JC)	1G	Kirk-Othmer, Encyclo	opedia of Chen	mical Technology, Third Edit	tion, Vol. 15, p	ı. 224, 1981.	
JB.	JH	R. Polsky-Cynkin et a Sandwich Hybridizati	al.,"Use of DN/ion, Clinical C	A Immobilized on Plastic an Chemistry, Vol. 31, No. 9, 198	d Agarose Su 85, pp. 1438-1	pports to Detect    443.	DNA by
863	JI	J. Welsh et al.,"Protei	in-DNA Cross-	s-Linking" TIBS, Vol. 9, Dece	ember 1984, pj	p. 505-508.	
80	IJ	G. H. Parsons, Jr., "Ar pp. 224-238.	.ntibody-Coate	ed Plastic Tubes in Radioim	munoassay", N	/leth., Enzymol.,	Vol. 73, 1973,
Jeb .	JK	Southern et al., Genor Oligonucleotides", Vol.	mics, "Analyzir 1.13, 1992, pp.	ing and Comprising Nucleic . 1008-1017.	Acid Sequenc	es by Hybridizati	ion to Arrays of
·	JL						
XAMINER		W Com		DATE CONCIDEREI	- C-1	1444 2001	7

Sheet 11 of 13 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FORM PTO 1449 (modified) ATTY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NO. 99\_1174 09/422.804 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S) (Use several sheets if necessary) **FILING DATE** GROUP Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005 October 22, 1999 1631 U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS \*EXAMINER DOCUMENT DATE NAME CLASS SUBCLASS FILING DATE IF INITIAL NUMBER **APPROPRIATE** KA 5,486,452 1/1996 Gordon et al. 435 5 KB 4,994,373 2/1991 Stavrianopoulos et al. 435 6 KC 4,968,602 11/1990 Dattagupta 435 6 KD 4.961.915 10/1990 Martin 422 116 ΚE 4,849,330 7/1989 Humphries et al. 435 4 KF 4,451,433 5/1984 Yamashita et al. 422 63 KG 5,202,231 4/1993 Drmanac 435 6 KH 4,299,916 11/1981 Litman et al. 435 6 **FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS** DOCUMENT DATE COUNTRY CLASS SUBCLASS **TRANSLATION** NUMBER YES NO KI 84/01031 3/1984 WO OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.) KJ Webster's Third New International Dictionary, G & C Merriam Company, Publishers, Springfield, Massachusetts, USA, 1966, pages with the definitions of the terms "solid" and "sheet". KK The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1991, page with the definition of the term "smooth". The Dictionary of Ceramic Science and Engineering, Plenum Press, New York, NY, 1984 - definition of "smooth KL glass". Academic Press Dictionary of Science and Technology, San Diego, CA, 1992 - definition of "smooth". KM KN S. F. Wolf et al., "Rapid Hybridization Kinetics of DNA Attached to Submicron Latex Particles", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, 1987, pp. 2911-2926. J. N. Kremsky et al., "Immobilization of DNA via Oligonucleotides Containing an Aldehyde or Carboxylic Acid KO Group at the 5' Terminus", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, 1987, pp. 2891-2909. **EXAMINER** nec DATE CONSIDERED

Sheet 12 of 13	3		INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEM	ENT			
FORM PTO 14	, ,	TMENT OF COMMER	CF	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL NO. 09/422,804		
	PATENT AN	ID TRADEMARK OFFI	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN		<del></del>	·	
	(Use seve	eral sheets if necessary) to PTO: December 8,		FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS	-			
EXAMINER	₹	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLA	SS SUBCLASS	FILING DA APPROPR	
	LA							
	LB							
<del></del>	ιc							
			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
•		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLA	SS SUBCLASS	TRANSLAT YES	ION NO
· · ·	LD							
	LE							
	LF							
	LG			****				_
	LH							
·	1	\		cluding Author, Title, Date, Perti		tc.)	<del></del>	_
	LI	Letter to Simon Kidd	le from Dr. Ren	nzo Malvano, November 2	2002.			
(	LJ [	etter to Simon Kidd	le from Dr. Giar	n Carlo Zucchelli, Novemb	ber 2002.			
no poblish	LK (	Declaration of Profes	sox Alberto Alb	ertini, November 2002.				
01	LL C	eclaration of Dr. Gi	anni Messehi N	Jovember 2002.				
	LM S	econd Statement of	Professor Roge	er Ekins, January 2003.				
	باهبا	<del>}</del>						

			<del></del>					<del></del>
Sheet 13 of 13		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT			
<b> </b>	FORM PTO 1449 (modified)			ATTY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NO. 99_1174 09/422,804				
PA	TENT A	RTMENT OF COMMERC ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN		<u> </u>		
Date		reral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631		
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS	<del></del>		<u> </u>	
*EXAMINER INITIAL		OOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA	
	МА							
	МВ							
			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS				
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	NOITA ON_
_	WC							
	MD							
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pert	inent Pages, Etc.)			
40 8/2	ME	Slides used in Profe April 1988.	ssor Ekins' lec	ture at the International B	iotech RIA '88 C	onférence in Flo	rence on 11	th
AC	MF			haracterization of Porous Adsorption, Vol. 6, 1999, p		orption: Models,	Simulations	and
. Jes	MG	Pharmacia Catalogu	e 1998, page o	describing Hybond-NX.				
Copistal	мн	Translation of EP A (	0197266 filed f	or UK national validation,	1991.			
	МІ	E. M. Southern, Awar	rd Molecular B	ioanalytics 2004, Biograp	hy.			
75/20/25/E	MJ	Award Molecular Bioa	analytics 2004.					
JO	мк	Bio Array News, Vol.	1, No. 1, June	1, 2001, pp. 1-10.				
Jes	ML	News Events, Journal	l of Biomolecul	lar Techniques, Vol. 15, 2	2004, pp. 152-15	53.		
EXAMINER	le	S. Bruser		DATE CONSIDER	RED 5 Febr	waly 200 6	·	

# Notice of References Cited

Application/Control No. 09/422,804	Applicant(s)/Pal Reexamination SOUTHERN, El	
Examiner	Art Unit	T
John S. Brusca	1631	Page 1 of 1

#### U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

[,	k	Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
√ [ <sup>7</sup>	A	US-3,356,462	12-1967	COOKE NELSON M; et. al.	422/102
	В	US-			
	С	US-			
	D	US-		:	
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	н	US-			
	ı	US-			
	J	US-			
	к	US-			
	L	US-			
	М	US-			

#### **FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	0					
	Р					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	1					

#### **NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS**

_			NON- ATEN DOCUMENTS
1/	<b>/*</b>		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
1		υ	Caulfield et al. A Computer Program for the Evaluation of ELISA Data Obtained Using an Automated Microtiter Plate Absorbance Reader. J. Immunol. Methods Vol. 74, pages 205-215 (1984)
		٧	Suggs et al. Use of synthetic oligonucleotides as hybridization probes: Isolation of cloned cDNA sequences for human beta2-microglobulin. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA Vol. 78, pages 6613-6617 (1981)
		w	
		х	

\*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).) Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

# This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

# **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

☐ BLACK BORDERS
☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
·

# IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.